

humor, with a keen insight into how to get things done in the U.S. Congress, and with a great deal of integrity.

He has reflected credit on the U.S. Senate and on the State of Mississippi, and I congratulate him very sincerely. I thank him for the honor of serving with him as his colleague from our State.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished senior colleague from the State of Mississippi for his comments this afternoon, and I thank him also for the relationship we have had together in Congress now over the last 24 years. We were in the House together, I believe, for 6 years, and then he came to the Senate in 1978. We continued to work together across the Capitol, and it was my great honor to join him in this body beginning in January 1989.

It has been a great relationship, one that I treasure very much. We not only enjoy working together on behalf of our State, I enjoy his company, and we quite often have lunch together. I have sided in next to him in that historic desk he has as the senior Senator from Mississippi, and we talk about our families, our wives, our football team, our future and our country, and I enjoy it always. We even tell a few stories, a few Mississippi jokes along the way to each other, but more than anything else, when the going gets rough, when I want real serious, steady, reliable advice given to me straight up, I go to my Senator from Mississippi who I work with from our delegation, and he gives me very good advice.

He has been a member of the leadership of the Senate now for many years. He has done an excellent job as chairman of our Republican conference. He is in our leadership meetings, and invariably, again, his advice and counsel is very good, and it is worth listening to. I found when I listen to it, I do OK, and when I don't, I usually mess up some way or the other.

I thank him for his comments today, but I also thank him for the fine relationship we have. We will continue to work together for our State and our country, and I look forward to that opportunity.

I yield the floor, Mr. President, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on September 26, the Senate failed to override the President's veto of a bill to ban a procedure known commonly as partial-birth abortion. Toward the end of that

rollcall vote No. 301, I changed my vote to nay. At the time, I am sure all my colleagues realized why I did so. I immediately entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the veto was sustained. In order to be able to make that motion to reconsider, it was, of course, necessary for me to cast my vote on the prevailing side. It was, indeed, my intention to return to the motion to reconsider the override vote, in the hope that continued public discussion and consideration might cause some of our colleagues to rethink their position and, in fact, vote to override the President's veto of the partial-birth abortion ban.

But the 104th Congress has run out of time, and it has been clear that no constructive purpose would have been served by yet another vote. While I am sure some Senators are having some serious second thoughts about that vote, there has been no indication that there has been a sufficient number change to reverse that earlier vote on the override.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to reconsider rollcall No. 301 and that the permanent RECORD of the 104th Congress note my intention to be included with the 57 other Senators who voted to override President Clinton's veto of the partial-birth abortion ban.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Let me say just a few words about the partial-birth abortion issue.

This is a matter that has touched the conscience of America. I note that, on both sides of the aisle, there are now several pro-choice Members who support the ban on partial-birth abortions.

I will not soon forget the dramatic moment when Senator COATS read the letter from our Coloradan colleague, Senator CAMPBELL, written from his hospital bed, telling us he would vote to override the veto, even though he supports abortion rights.

This is clearly an issue that will not go away. Indeed, I anticipate early action on it in the 105th Congress. By which time, continuing public education about the partial-birth procedure will, I believe, change many congressional minds.

Here is just one example. Most of the debate on both sides of this issue, has concentrated on the use of partial-birth abortion in late-term pregnancies. That may, indeed, be the most shocking aspect.

But interviews with abortion doctors by the Washington Post, the American Medical News, and the Bergen County, N.J., Record reveal that the great majority of partial-birth abortions—thousands every year—are performed in the fifth and sixth months of pregnancy. And almost all of them are performed for entirely nonmedical reasons.

When President Clinton vetoed the partial-birth abortion ban, he suggested an alternative. It turns out that his alternative would be, in practical

terms, nothing more than the status quo.

In the first place, it would not ban a single one of the thousands of partial-birth abortions performed in the second trimester of pregnancy.

In the second place, its "serious health" loophole, as "health" has been interpreted by the courts, would render meaningless restrictions even in the last months of pregnancy.

When the Senate returns to this issue in 1997, as indeed it must, I hope we will find sufficient unity to ban the partial-birth procedure at all stages of pregnancy.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WILLIAM COHEN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate Armed Services Committee had a hearing. It happened to be that the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were our principal witnesses, and the subject was the ongoing controversy in Bosnia.

Seated next to me, as he has been for these many years of joint service on that committee, was Senator BILL COHEN. It is hard for me to express in words my respect for this great American and this great U.S. Senator, a man who truly is a global thinker. And today he was as profound and as incisive as he has been for all these years that I have been privileged to serve with him on the Armed Services Committee.

He has occupied, somewhere in this area of the Senate floor, the chair that he has selected for Maine. But Maine's chair is the chair for the United States of America when it comes to the matter of national security, foreign policy.

We may have differed on some occasions, but more often we have been together. And he has been a fearless speaker, an absolutely fearless speaker and advocate for what he believes is best for the United States and, indeed, the world.

We have taken trips together. I have seen him in the presence of world leaders, heads of State, heads of Government, and within moments after entering a room, whether it is Europe, Asia, or the Middle East, he is greeted and accepted and listened to as an equal.

He is a very hard worker, diligent in his representation for his State, a prodigious student of history. But he always found time, Mr. President, he always found time to spread his great intellect on the written pages of books, be they novels, or, more importantly, for this Senator, be they poems. Lucky

is the Member of the Senate, or perhaps an observing staffer, who found at Senator COHEN's seat, more often at a committee hearing, a doodle. I am not much for doodling, but he is an expert, and it is not some scribble.

What surprises me, having studied engineering and particularly engineering drawing and architecture drawing myself—I am a man who observes a straight line or the French curve or whatever—these are drawings that challenge the best of engineering drawings, very precise, a balance, perspective, and I defy anyone to interpret the meaning. And therein is the real genius.

He is able to take these drawings and capture the meaning of the debate in the committee hearing. I have never seen him doodle in the Senate—maybe he has—not in the Chamber, but certainly as I sat next to him in the Armed Services Committee, the Select Committee on Aging. They are absolutely magnificent.

I asked him one time, "Are these your ideas of caricatures of other Senators?"

"No. They are caricatures of the debate that is taking place, and how I see that debate, where it starts, where it goes, whether it is conclusive or inconclusive, whether it is fair and whether it is objective."

I have one or two, and I treasure them.

He is a meticulous researcher. Perhaps above all, that research to bear on legislation that he sponsored—and for a while I was not totally in favor of that legislation—but it was legislation that eventually put into law the special operating forces of the United States.

Much of the work of those forces is highly classified, and therefore I cannot discuss it on the floor of the Senate. But the essence of his legislation was to enable our Nation and our Armed Forces to have a cadre of men and women in uniform who were able to perform the most difficult of military tasks, whether it is a task that challenges two or three or a task that challenges a company-sized group of military. And those challenges could come at any time, any moment, anywhere on the globe.

Because of this man's foresight, we have that capability here in the United States. My only suspicion at the time that we used to debate it was whether or not it was not already present in the Armed Forces of the United States and whether or not the command and control should be under, say, the Chief of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. And he was right; this should be a separate CINC, a separate four-star officer, whose sole responsibility was not to the other services, but to see that this cadre of service persons had the equipment, had the training, had the skills and the fortitude to take on any challenge anywhere in the world.

So I join the others who expressed a note of sadness of his departure, but

also a sadness of joy that he and his lovely wife have reclaimed—reclaimed—their lives from public service. He, with nearly a quarter of a century, 24 years in the Congress of the United States, has reclaimed it to go on and have other challenges. I do not doubt for a moment that he will accept the challenges which will enable him to enter into the global policy discussions and other forums of the world as it relates to foreign policy and national security, but also to reclaim perhaps a little more time to spread his genius upon the paper that all of us can share, be it fiction, be it prose, be it poetry, or be it a foreign policy decision. I wish him well.

I yield the floor, Mr. President, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I intended to address the Senate and I shall address the Senate with respect to the distinguished Senator from Alabama who has joined the ranks of those reclaiming his balance of time pursuant to a manner that most befits the desires and the goals of the Senator and his lovely wife.

I did not realize you would be here, Senator. I would not suggest that you deviate from whatever you intended to do while I just have a few words here about my dear friend, but I envy you in many ways.

We could always start out with the thought that he brought to the Senate and to public service for his Nation and his State a knowledge of the law and a respect for the law and an understanding of the law, and an understanding that the Congress of the United States has the responsibility under the Constitution to enact the law. How many times have I heard him say, and others have heard him, that enacting the law is our responsibility—not that of the bureaucrats, the vast army of bureaucrats—to write the regulations. Tenaciously, he has fought for strict adherence of the Constitution in the law of the land and not to delegate it to the army of bureaucrats. Yes, I admire him for that, but I suppose I admire him because of the tremendous admiration and warmth of feeling that other Senators have for him.

I have enjoyed several trips to remote places of the world in connection with military matters, I think, on most occasions, the focal point of the trip. Perhaps that focal point was generated by the somewhat disproportionate size and stature of this great Senator, but more often than not it was because of his display of intellect and

grasp of the mission on which we were sent to some remote place on behalf of the interests of the United States and the Senate.

I was always interested when he would come to the floor in connection with appointments to the Federal judiciary, particularly as it related to the Supreme Court of the United States. He, in a very tough, I believe, fair, and objective manner, laid out the qualifications or the absence of qualifications, in his judgment, and the Senate listened. The Senate listened out of profound respect for our colleague. There were times when his great sense of humor and his sense of camaraderie would give away to a parochial interest.

I have seen him exhibit such fervor, particularly in the well of the Senate, as to alarm other Senators to the point that they would go in opposite directions rather than confront him. That happened, Mr. President, more often than not on peanuts. No one in the contemporary history of the Senate has fought harder for the peanut farmer than the distinguished Senator from Alabama. He would seize us by the arm and make certain that we had commitments from fellow Senators as related to peanuts. I enjoy eating peanuts, but there were times in the intensity of that debate that I lost all interest and appetite for peanuts. But there he was, and for good reason. The peanut farmers are small. Nobody has made a fortune in peanuts; never have and never will, in my judgment; that is, the farmer. It represents to him the spirit of American agriculture.

He has served on the Senate Agriculture Committee throughout his entire career in the U.S. Senate. He has a great respect for those who till the soil and love the land that produces the bountiful harvests that we all enjoy, and really accept almost as a matter of right, in this country.

Agriculture is our principal export as it relates to improving the balance of trade.

There sits a Senator like a stone wall to defend the role of the American farmer and the agriculture of this great land. There sits a Senator like a stone wall to protect the freedoms of people, especially those freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

We will miss you, my dear friend. And I thank you for the opportunity to have spoken a few words from the heart in the deepest of gratitude for your friendship and your wisdom that you have so willfully given this country during your distinguished career.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am deeply humbled to hear the kind words of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia—and he is truly a gentleman from Virginia. I appreciate them very deeply.